



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/502,344	05/11/2005	Richard Ross	100042.55084US	9192
23911	7590	04/20/2006	EXAMINER	
CROWELL & MORING LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP P.O. BOX 14300 WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300			WOODWARD, CHERIE MICHELLE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1647	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/502,344	ROSS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cherie M. Woodward	1647	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Cherie M. Woodward.

(3) _____.

(2) J.D. Evans.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 April 2006

Time: 10:52am EST

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

1 and 15

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
The Examiner contacted Applicants' representative to seek clarity on claims 1 and 15 because the claims, as drafted, were confusing. Additionally, the dependency of claim 15 on claim 1 appears to have been inadvertently deleted from claim 15 in Applicants' amendment to the claims accompanying Applicants' Response to the Restriction Requirement, submitted 8 March 2006. Applicants' representative clarified the dependency and stated that claim 15 should depend from claim 1. Further, Applicants' representative clarified claims 1 and 15 and stated that both claims should read on receptor binding domains of a ligand. Applicants' representative stated that he will be submitting a voluntary amendment to further clarify the claims.